

Notes for Windy-Shingle Public Meeting

January 31, 2017; Riggins, Idaho

These notes are intended to capture the broader topics, issues and concerns relative to the Windy-Shingle proposed project that were discussed at the public information meeting on January 31st.

Attendees

- **Public Meeting:** Approximately 17 people were in attendance from the local communities
- **Forest Service employees attending:** Cheryl Probert, Nez Perce – Clearwater Forest Supervisor; Kurt Steele, Deputy Forest Supervisor; Jeff Shinn, Salmon River District Ranger; Craig Phillips, Project Team Leader; Nate Millet, Hydrologist/Soils; AJ Helgenberg, Silviculturist; Joan Brown, Silviculturist; Susan Harries, Silviculturist; Linda Bernhardt, Wildlife Biologist; Kevin Barger, Fire/Fuels Specialist; Tim Price, Fisheries Biologist; Jeanette Dreadfulwater, Public Affairs; Christine Stewart, Fisheries Biologist



Figure 1: Local community members and Forest Service staff discuss the Windy-Shingle potential treatment areas at the January 31st public meeting

Issues/Concerns/Feedback from Public

Participants

- **Treatment of old growth stands:** Concern was expressed that treatments in old growth areas that may be warranted by stand conditions may not be applied due to policies for old growth. Further concern was voiced regarding the definition of old growth, the commenter noting that some old growth may be second growth.
- **Buffers around wetlands and streams:** There was concern regarding what work could be done in the buffer areas established around wetlands and streams. That concern was also for a lack of active treatment in those buffer areas potentially leading to dangerous fuel accumulation.
- **Additional treatment** for hazardous fuel reduction was proposed by one attendee around potential Treatment Area 5, near Road 517 (Seven Devil's Road) and the Forest System land boundary.
- **Prescribed burning:**
 - **Air Quality:** Smoke production during prescribed burning treatments and post-harvest site management was a concern expressed. One attendee was particularly concerned about smoke due to an asthmatic relative in the home.
 - **Fire containment:** An attendee expressed concern for our ability to effectively contain prescribed burns and for resource damage in the event of an escape.
- **Timber Sale Unit size:** It was suggested by one attendee that there be smaller timber sale units offered rather than one large unit for the project.



Figure 2: Local community members and Forest Service staff discuss historic burns in and near the Windy-Shingle project area at the January 31st public meeting

- **Unit 10A Insect and disease conditions:** One commenter expressed that he had not seen widespread insect and disease issues in unit 10A.
- **Leave trees:** Two Attendees were under the impression that economic, rather than ecological, objectives were the primary drivers shaping the treatment proposal. In particular, they were concerned that the logging contractor was allowed to decide what trees are left standing during harvest. They were informed that Forest Service personnel select and mark leave trees. They also expressed concern that leave trees may be more susceptible to wind damage post-harvest, due to the shallow soils.

General Questions from Participants during the Presentation

- During the **initial presentation** to describe the collaboration process, the Farm Bill Categorical Exclusion environmental review process, and the potential treatment areas and prescriptions, several questions were asked by audience members.
 - The Project Team Leader was asked if information was **available on the internet**. He responded that all information from the meeting would be posted on the project web page. He noted there were instructions for accessing the project web page through various pathways on the sign-in table.
 - The Project Team Leader was asked about the process by which the Governor sought designation of the area as an **insect and disease priority area** under the 2014 Farm Bill. Forest Supervisor Probert explained that the Forest Service assisted the State of Idaho by providing information to support their request for that designation. The project area is only a small part of the areas designated in Idaho.
 - The team was asked to explain **intermediate and regeneration harvest** in layman's terms. The project silviculturist explained that an intermediate harvest is essentially a thinning that is sometimes referred to as a **selective harvest**. Trees would be removed from a stand with the goal of improving the health and vigor of the remaining trees by removing competitors for resources. A regeneration harvest would remove most of the trees in an area with the goal of creating conditions conducive to **establishing a new generation** of young trees.
 - Some attendees asked if **firewood gathering** opportunities would be available after harvest and before temporary roads are decommissioned. Forest Supervisor Probert committed to working with the logging contractor to seek opportunities for safe firewood cutting.



Next Steps

The team anticipates releasing a scoping document before mid-February, 2017 with more detailed project area and treatment descriptions as adjusted by some comments received at the public meeting. This document will contain a detailed project proposal including maps and descriptions of all proposed activities. It will also include

any adjustments made in response to comments received at the public meeting. A decision is anticipated by mid-June of 2017.

THANK YOU

*to Principal Dennis Fredrickson
for allowing us to use the Salmon
River High School Activity Room
for our public meeting!*